

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-24 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 7, 13, 15, 17 and 19 being the independent claims.

Examiner Interview

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended by Examiner Perez and Supervisory Examiner Ramos during the personal interview conducted on April 6, 2004. During the interview, independent claim 1 and dependent claim 2 were discussed with respect to the Kimoto patent. Applicants' representative noted the differences between the disclosed "attributes" and "features" of the present application and the Kimoto patent.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,115,611 to Kimoto et al. ("the Kimoto patent").

The Kimoto patent discloses a communication system including a mobile unit that can be used to transmit and receive data to/from a database. The information received from the database can be retrieved based on the position of the mobile unit. The information retrieved from the database includes descriptive information such as a business name, address, phone number, business description, etc.

Independent Claims 1, 7, 13, 15 and 17 and their Dependent Claims

Independent claim 1 recites "receiving location-centric attribute information from said information system related to a landmark proximate to said geographic position, the location-centric attribute information being related to at least one of an interior ***physical feature*** and an exterior ***physical feature***." *Independent claim 7* recites "transmitting location-centric attribute

information related to a landmark proximate to said geographic position, the location-centric attribute information being related to at least one of either an interior *physical feature* and an exterior *physical feature* of said landmark.” *Independent claim 13* recites a receiver configured to “location-centric attribute information related to said at least one location identifier, the location-centric attribute information being related to at least one of either an interior *physical feature* and an exterior *physical feature* of said landmark.” *Independent claim 15* recites “receiving location-centric attribute information from said information system, said location-centric attribute information related to a landmark proximate to said geographic position, the location-centric attribute information being related to at least one of either an interior *physical feature* and an exterior *physical feature* of said landmark.” *Independent claim 17* recites “a wireless device operable to provide geographic position information to said information database and to receive from said information database at least one location identifier based on said geographic position, said location identifier being representative of a landmark proximate to said geographic position, the location-centric attribute information being related to at least one of either an interior *physical feature* and an exterior *physical feature* of the landmark.”

As discussed during the personal interview, the Kimoto patent fails to disclose any information that is related to physical features of a landmark as recited in claims 1, 7, 13, 15 and 17. At most, the Kimoto patent discloses an address, phone number, and general description of the type of business located at a particular position. There is no disclosure or suggestion whatsoever of “location-centric attribute information being related to at least one of either an interior *physical feature* and an exterior *physical feature*” as recited in claims 1, 7, 13, 15 and 17. For at least this reason, independent claims 1, 7, 13, 15 and 17 are allowable over the

Kimoto patent. Based at least on their dependence upon independent claims 1, 7, 13, 15 and 17, dependent claims 2-6, 8-12, 14, 16 and 18 are also allowable.

Independent Claim 19 and its Dependent Claims

Independent claim 19 recites “receiving location-centric attribute information from said information system, said location-centric attribute information being related to a ***residential*** dwelling proximate to said geographic position”

As discussed during the personal interview, the Kimoto patent fails to disclose or suggest “location-centric attribute information related to a residential dwelling” as recited in claim 19. For at least this reason, independent claim 19 is allowable. Based at least on its dependence on independent claim 19, dependent claim 20 is also allowable.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting over U.S. Patent No. 6,496,776. Applicants will file a Terminal Disclaimer upon indication of allowable subject matter.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

COOLEY GODWARD LLP

Date: May 6, 2004

By:



Erik B. Milch
Reg. No. 42,887

COOLEY GODWARD LLP
11951 Freedom Drive
Reston Town Center
Reston, Virginia 20190-5656
(703) 456-8000 – Phone
(703) 456-8100 – Facsimile